

be read the third time, and passed, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 13) was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 13

Whereas the United States has conferred honorary citizenship on four other occasions in more than 200 years of its independence, and honorary citizenship is and should remain an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred nor frequently granted;

Whereas Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette or General Lafayette, voluntarily put forth his own money and risked his life for the freedom of Americans;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette, by an Act of Congress, was voted to the rank of Major General;

Whereas, during the Revolutionary War, General Lafayette was wounded at the Battle of Brandywine, demonstrating bravery that forever endeared him to the American soldiers;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette secured the help of France to aid the United States' colonists against Great Britain;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was conferred the honor of honorary citizenship by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was the first foreign dignitary to address Congress, an honor which was accorded to him upon his return to the United States in 1824;

Whereas, upon his death, both the House of Representatives and the Senate draped their chambers in black as a demonstration of respect and gratitude for his contribution to the independence of the United States;

Whereas an American flag has flown over his grave in France since his death and has not been removed, even while France was occupied by Nazi Germany during World War II; and

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette gave aid to the United States in her time of need and is forever a symbol of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette, is proclaimed to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

DESIGNATING 2002 THE YEAR OF THE ROSE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 285, S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) designating 2002 as the "Year of the Rose".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time, passed, the pre-

amble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

Whereas the study of fossils has shown that the rose has been a native wild flower in the United States for over 35,000,000 years;

Whereas the rose is grown today in every State;

Whereas the rose has long represented love, friendship, beauty, peace, and the devotion of the American people to their country;

Whereas the rose has been cultivated and grown in gardens for over 5,000 years and is referred to in both the Old and New Testaments;

Whereas the rose has for many years been the favorite flower of the American people, has captivated the affection of humankind, and has been revered and renowned in art, music, and literature;

Whereas our first President was also our first rose breeder, 1 of his varieties being named after his mother and still being grown today; and

Whereas in 1986 the rose was designated and adopted as the national floral emblem of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) designates the year of 2002 as the "Year of the Rose"; and

(2) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, December 19; that immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Senate resume consideration of the farm bill; further, that the vote on cloture on the substitute amendment occur at 1:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be rollcall votes on the farm bill tomorrow morning, as we know.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if there is no further business to come before the Senate, following the statement by the Senator from Arkansas for 5 minutes and the statement by the Senator from Alabama for 10 minutes, the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate everyone's cooperation. I know the hour is late. It is a very difficult bill for everyone, but I do appreciate the cooperation tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

WANTING A FARM BILL

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have the permission of the Senator from Arkansas to go first.

I do take offense at the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, saying we do not want a farm bill. That is not true. I do want a farm bill. I do not think there is a Senator here who does not want one, and I would like to see one completed before we leave.

I have been talking to farmers back home in my State, and they tell me frankly they like Cochran-Roberts. I am pleased to support the amendment that Senator HUTCHINSON has offered that has the House structure with some additional language in it that we think makes the bill even better. That was my farm bill that I offered, along with Senator HUTCHINSON and four Democrats. There were four Democrats and three Republicans on that bill. I believe the Presiding Officer was on that bill. It was a good bipartisan bill.

As the bill went through the system, the committee dealt with it and the majority leader dealt with it, and pretty soon we had a bill that was not as balanced as we would like to see it.

A lot of people in this Senate who care about agriculture—and there are some other than Senator HARKIN—are really concerned about the legislation and want a good bill.

Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi who chair the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is one of the most knowledgeable people in this Senate on agricultural issues.

Senator PAT ROBERTS chaired the House Committee on Agriculture and is one of the most knowledgeable people in this Senate on agriculture.

Senator LUGAR, the former chairman of the Agriculture Committee and one of the finest Members of this body, is not comfortable with this legislation, and he certainly, as a farmer, cares about agriculture. So does Senator GRASSLEY who spoke earlier, a farmer himself, and a senior member of the Agriculture Committee.

They just do not agree with Senator HARKIN on everything that is in a bill that he admits is not perfect.

What we ought to do, and what I would have expected to happen, is that these responsible, experienced Senators and farm experts would be able to get together and work out some of the problems and not end up with a problem with the House and a problem with the President.

How are we going to get a bill passed if it cannot be conferred? How are we going to get a bill passed if the President vetoes it? It is not going to happen. Let's get together now. That is the problem.

My farmers are telling me they believe all three of these bills can help them. They like all three of these bills, but we have to look at it in terms of a national policy and work out something with which everybody can work.

The problem has been, frankly, that the majority has not shown enough respect, in my view, to Senators COCHRAN, ROBERTS, GRASSLEY and LUGAR who have been trying to make some improvements in the bill. They have not talked to them on any significant issue, only minor issues, and we end up at loggerheads. The President is very unhappy with what he sees.

Even if we pass something before we leave, if it is not legislation that is likely to move forward, we have not done anything. That is why I appreciate Senator HUTCHINSON's offering of our original bipartisan bill that we know can get through the House, and we believe the President will sign it. I believe we will have a farm bill in a matter of days—hours, really. That would be good for agriculture.

The people with whom I have talked are concerned about delay. They would like this bill passed as soon as possible. They want to make their plans for next year. They want to talk with their banks and see about the financing they will need. We do need to move as fast as possible.

It would be quite preferable for us to move and have a bill passed that the President would sign before we recess. There is no doubt about that. I would like to see that done. But Senator HARKIN and the majority leader are basically saying: Take our bill just as we have written it, even though we have a vote or two over 50 for it, but we will not talk with you.

I have seen Senator DASCHLE when he was the Democratic leader use the power of 40 votes and ask for compromise and get it time and again. That is what this body is about. I just have not seen enough progress in a bipartisan way here. I believe there has just been an effort to stampede this bill through to try to gin up people and say: The Harkin bill is the only one that can do the job, and it must be passed now; and if you do not pass the Harkin bill now, you do not care about farmers, you do not care about agriculture, you would just as soon leave them out there and let them go bankrupt. That is just not true. I resent that.

I come from a farming family. My daddy had a farm equipment dealership. My grandparents were farmers. I grew up in the country. I know about farming. I have seen them come into my daddy's business with a tractor broken down, with hay in the field, a hay baler not working, needing help, knowing if the rain came and they did not get the crop in, they could lose most everything. And we did not have the programs then that we have today. I understand that. I grew up in that community. I want a farm bill, and I do not like it when somebody says I do not.

And I do not like it when they say: If you do not agree with me and agree to vote on a bill I want on which we will accept no significant amendments, then we are going to accuse you of being against agriculture. I do not believe that is right.

That is where we are, and everybody knows it. There is no mystery about where this deal is tonight.

I want to make one more point.

There are several problems with the Harkin bill. From what I am hearing, other people are also expressing those concerns. It seems to me that the Harkin bill will increase production at a time when our production is high. And if it goes higher it will be even harder to sustain legitimate crop prices. That is a real problem. We have pretty high production now. Cotton is up. None is down that I know of. We don't need to institutionalize or create an incentive to do that.

We want to do this thing in a way that does not leave us subject to the charge of the Europeans who say we are protectionists and that we are violating WTO commitments. If we can avoid violating them and accomplish the same thing, we ought to do it. I hope and pray that the Europeans will see their extraordinary subsidies for agriculture are not justified. I hope they will begin to reduce some of that, and we will see increased exports around the world in other places besides Europe.

If we can avoid it, we ought not violate our trade agreements. I am afraid in a few years the experts will say we are in violation of our international trade commitments, putting us at a disadvantage when we try to negotiate with our trading partners who I think have been violating the law consistently. We will not be as authoritative with the same moral basis to argue they need to get right with the law.

We need a bill that can go to conference and be signed by the President promptly. That is why I believe the legislation Senator HUTCHINSON has offered tonight is a good vehicle for that.

There are two ways we can get a farm bill as I see it, just like this. We can have a good-faith, compromise negotiation discussion between the slim majority and the leaders on this side who are fine people, fine Senators, who have a history, a record, and a career of supporting agriculture—Senators GRASSLEY, ROBERTS, COCHRAN—and talk with them and see if they cannot work out something. If they do not, we have another vehicle, a vehicle Senator HUTCHINSON would offer, to solve the problem. Those are the two ways. Maybe there will be another and cloture will be achieved.

I know one thing: If we did those two things, we would be out of here and we would have a bill the President would most likely sign and we would have fulfilled our duty.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his cosponsorship of this legislation and for his excellent statement. I also commend the Presiding Officer this evening for his role and hard work on the peanut program and his great victory on that issue and his hard work on the Agriculture bill and for his willingness to stay this late. I am sure the Presiding Officer is ready to wind this up.

I wish my colleagues could have seen the farmers I met with this past Saturday. One asked the prospects for getting a bill completed and to the President. I began to explain the Senate process. We have cloture; we may not get it. If we get it, we get a bill that has to go to conference. There is a lot of difference between the House and the Senate. I explained that and their eyes glazed over. There were tears. They said that would not do a lot of good for making loans and plans and getting ready for the upcoming planting season.

We have reached the point of finger pointing, both sides saying the other does not want a bill this year. I suggest Senator SESSIONS outlined two ways we have a chance of getting one. They are genuine compromises. We can pass the House bill I filed this evening, which I urged in my floor speeches we move this year. I wrote Chairman HARKIN and urged quick action and voted for the Harkin commodity title, and voted for the committee bill, voted for cloture last week; I voted for cloture today. I want a farm bill.

The way I see it, Senator HARKIN made a significant admission and said, if we invoke cloture and pass his bill tomorrow night, it will be weeks before a conference can work out the differences between the House and Senate and get a bill to the President.

There were a lot of Democrats who voted against Cochran-Roberts. But do we say a lot of Democrats do not want a farm bill because they would not support that? Of course not. We all have ideas of what the ideal farm bill is. We cannot get an ideal farm bill in these closing days. None of us would know exactly what it was.

There is one way we can get a bill this year. That is to move this House-like bill cosponsored by Republicans and Democrats—four Democrats, three Republicans—and move it immediately to the President. Tomorrow we will find out who is really wanting a bill this year and who is really wanting to stall one out—whether it is pride of authorship: my bill is the only bill, or whether we are willing to get an improvement in farm policy under this budget and to the President and signed into law.

I hope tomorrow there is good news this Christmas for America's farmers.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his patience, and I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 11:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 11:30 tomorrow, Wednesday, December 19, 2001.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:36 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, December 19, 2001, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18, 2001:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NANCY DORN, OF TEXAS, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE SEAN O'KEEFE.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EMMY B. SIMMONS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED

STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.
(NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BRIAN MICHAEL ENNIS, OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CLEVELAND VAUGHN.

CHESTER MARTIN KEELY, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE WILLIAM HENRY VON EDWARDS, III, RESIGNED.

JOHN WILLIAM LOYD, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT BRUCE ROBERTSON.

WILLIAM SMITH TAYLOR, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROBERT JAMES MOORE.

DAVID DONALD VILES, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE LAURENT F. GILBERT.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. GEORGE J. FLYNN, 0000
COL. JOHN F. KELLY, 0000

COL. MARYANN KRUSADOSSIN, 0000
COL. FRANK A. PANTER JR., 0000
COL. CHARLES S. PATTON, 0000
COL. MASTIN M. ROBESON, 0000
COL. TERRY G. ROBLING, 0000
COL. RICHARD T. TRYON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. EMERSON N. GARDNER JR., 0000
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD A. HUCK, 0000
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN T. JOHNSON, 0000
BRIG. GEN. BRADLEY M. LOTT, 0000
BRIG. GEN. KEITH J. STALDER, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. WEBER, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 624 AND 3064:

To be major

LESLIE C. SMITH II, 0000 JA